

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102.

Claims 1-6, 9, 10, 13, 14, 17, 18 and 21-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 as being anticipated by Suparashi (US 2001/0005082).

In response to the newly stated rejection, all claims but Claim 25 have been cancelled, and the limitations of the dependent Claims 26-28 have been incorporated into amended Claim 25.

In part, the rejection is founded upon the Examiner's observation that applicant has taken the position that Suparashi is not a central locking system. But applicant has not taken that position, and agrees with the Examiner that Suparashi is a central locking system.

Suparashi is certainly relevant prior art. However, the basis of a 35 U.S.C. 102 rejection is that the invention claimed is the same at the disclosure of the prior art reference.

Applicant's device, as claimed in Claim 25, is different in both structure and function from Suparashi..

Suparashi is explicit that pushing the door handle 16 outwardly to the position of Figure 9 will operate the locking switch 36, and pulling the door handle inwardly toward the occupant will operate the unlocking switch 34. There is no teaching or suggestion in Suparashi that pushing the door handle outwardly to the position of Figure 9 would operate the switches in a manner to accomplish either the locking or the unlocking of the central locking system, from whichever condition was then prevailing.

In contrast, applicant, as recited in Claim 25, claims a central locking system in which pushing the door handle outwardly will accomplish either the locking or an unlocking of the central locking system. In applicant's system, pushing the handle outwardly will lock the door if the door is unlocked, or unlock the door if the door is locked. Thus, applicant has provided and claimed structure and function not existing in the Suparashi reference.

Additionally, Claim 25 recites that the opening lever is pivotably disposed on the door by a rotating pivot pin, and the switch is operated directly by the rotating of the rotating pivot pin by the handle.

Suparashi does not meet the recitation of a pivot pin directly operating the switch. In Suparashi, a door handle 16 is hinged for rotation about a pivot axis A1 on the inside of the door, and linked to a locking and unlocking switches 34 and 36 by sophisticated and complex mechanism including drive pin 24 on the handle 16, a cam 38, and an actuating lever 44, by which the simple rotation of the door handle induces complicated camming and pivoting motions to operate the locking and unlocking switches 34 and 36. Thus, applicant has claimed new and elegantly simplified structure to operate the central locking and unlocking switch.

In view of the foregoing amendment, and cancellation of other claims, applicant respectfully urges that the application is in condition for allowance of Claim 25 as presented herein. The applicant's attorney appreciates the clarity of the Examiner's position as stated in the Office Action, and makes the amendments herein in response to an increased understanding of the rejection in consequence of that rejection.

Allowance of Claim 25 is earnestly solicited.

Please charge any fees that may be due to Deposit Account No. 07-0960.

Respectfully submitted,

/Laura C. Hargitt/
Laura Hargitt – Attorney
Reg. No. 43,989
Telephone: 313-665-4710

Date: October 19, 2007